DRAFT
DNCT Steering Committee
Meeting Notes
11/30/98
9:00-12:00

Attendees:

Agenda:
i. EWA
ii. Hybrid Scenario
iii. Model runs
iv. CCWD WQ
v. Speer/Quinn Op tools

Highlights
I. Discussed details of EWA
II. Discussed details of Hybrid Scenario including Day 1- Stage 1 concepts and operating principles.
III. Discussed problems for WQ under Hybrid plus benefits of Hood diversion.

Actions:
vi. Simulate use of EWA water for env.
vii. Define who will manage EWA in first year.
viii. DWRSIM model runs for C1 hybrid conditions
ix. Review model runs.
x. Define sharing rules for Day 1 new water supplies.
xi. Define rules for Day 1 EWA water storage and conveyance.
xii. Define approach for protecting WQ.

EWA
1. (Was not present)

Hybrid
End of Stage 1 -
- Build share in EWA through new storage 300-600 TAF (total)
- Add to share with expanded Banks and Intertie, reclamation (20TAF), expansion of option contracts, and credits from relaxing VAMP.
- Need for upstream and Delta ops coordination, plus daily accounting
- Water purchases for env under ERP and CVPIA would be part of EWA account - only one account. Integrated management of EWA/ERP/CVPIA env water.
- Speer issues: Fundability and ESA protection under Eco Manager.
- Op prin: no harm

- Power production issue: EWA may have to pay for power losses.
- Collateral- real or probably assets in EWA. Need to call on assets to reduce exports when necessary. Assets are low early in water year. Assets primarily in surface and GW storage. Some options contract water available.
- Debt - collateral use dependent on whether deliveries affected by export reductions.

Hybrid Run Prescriptions:

- Day 1: Scenario C1 without ISDP (expanded Banks) + 100 Kern WB + JPOD (with and without new Trinity impacts to water supply)
- 8 Years Into: C1-v2 + Trinity
- C1 + 61 day VAMP
- C1 - Delta AFRP
- Firm water would take precedence.
- Env would be constrained by non-firm water and exchange/transfers.
- Env water movement through conveyance facilities would have lowest priority.
- New and existing storage would have different priority rules.
- Biol target: mortality (salvage) reduction.

2. George: EWA water spills first - specialty accounts spill second.
3. Jim W: COA should be built into what we are doing at present.
4. George: that would be impossible in the time we have remaining. COA simply divides SWP/CVP supplies. A dry year would test the COA.
5. Jim W: When do we look at Delta simulations of operations?
6. George: Need to look at South Delta stages, water quality, and conveyance. Priorities are difficult to define.
7. Pete C: initial evaluation looking to see how big EWA is versus how much water it takes to meet new standards.
8. Elise: We have to show water is there for EWA and when we need to use it.
9. Pete C: Infinite ways to use EWA water.
10. Dave F: We should show how the EWA would be applied.
11. Pete R: Not all DEFT members have approved the Hybrid concept.
12. Dave F: not required that we all agree on how to use EWA water. Concerned about how ESA would be protected under Eco Manager concept. Regardless, decision making authority would be in the agencies hands.
13. Pete R: We are giving up to early if we let ESA become the driver - we have an ecosystem approach.
14. Elise: from Day 1 agencies will control EWA.
15. Pete C: each agency has different responsibilities. ESA will take priority.
16. Mike F: agencies will want to be involved to make sure ESA species will not be neglected, but should let EWA be managed as prescribed.
17. Dave F: the committee approach versus Eco Manager will not be optimal, but questions whether we can do anything else on Day 1.
18. Mike F: key will be to preestablish triggers for EWA.
19. Pete R: important to define responsibilities for Day 1. Also accountability.

20. Dave F: we should put interpretations of decision making and accountability refinements in italics.
21. BJ: we should fight harder for Eco Manager concept.
22. Ron: we have to get past the first 13 months after Day 1.
23. Elise: it will be hard to get Eco Manager concept working in first year.
24. Pete C: Plan has a lot of detail. How do we deal with editing the plan for EWA?
25. Dave F: sharing of water on Day 1.
26. BJ: Sharing will be vague.
27. Pete C: element by element sharing is straight forward. Sharing of total new supply is OK concept.
28. Dave F: we should define - EWA block of water after VAMP calculation. Add CVPIA water purchase to EWA. Determine power costs. Define priorities of EWA water in State and Federal storage. Define how we move toward Eco Manager during Stage 1.

Water Quality - Dave B:

- Define water quality considerations.
- Correct DWRSIM for 5.6 MAF yield
- analysis is biased toward 1981-1990 sequence of year types.
- analysis should focus on Rock Slough, Old River, DMC, Tracy, CCForebay, Jersey Point TDS.
- Scenario A1 will not help WQ much. Concern continues for high fall exports - effect on TDS/bromides on urban water stored. AFRP continues trend of shifting exports from spring good WQ period to fall poor WQ period.
- Scenario A1: big problems for WQ may be biased high.
- Hood diversion significant benefit to WQ.
- Hard to predict effects of higher fall pumping in combination with DCC closure - could be big problem - but Hood may counteract.
- NNG tools recover water in summer and fall when WQ is poor.
- Solution: boost fall inflow - most help to Delta water users.
- Model runs had Oct-June DCC closed - this is too restrictive.
- Extended VAMP may have some effect on WQ.
- Barriers not included. HOR barrier may have some benefit to WQ.

29. Jim S: fall inflow boost would have additional carraige water cost to water supply.
30. Jim W: Scenario F will push more exports into Fall.
31. Dave B: Fall dry periods are not concern; its the wet years where water quality is greatest problem.
32. Dave F: agencies don't want Hood open all the time. Only when DCC is closed. This may hinder WQ benefits of Hood.